



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

FACTS OF CONSCIOUSNESS.

Translated from the German of J. G. FICHTE, by A. E. KROEGER.

PART FIRST.

THE THEORETICAL FACULTY.

CHAPTER IV.

CONCERNING TIME.

A.—The Ego has been posited absolutely through thinking; it exists absolutely independent of its own self-contemplation, and exists thus as free principle in the manner in which we have determined this conception above.

I add now: *a principle is necessarily infinite*. For if it ever ceased to be principle, and after any possible series of manifestations were finally to vanish altogether in some last one, it would not have been absolutely posited as principle, nor would being principle have constituted its real essence; it would have been simply the conditioned principle for such a determined series of manifestations.

In making this additional assertion, what sort of an insight do I produce in you? I reply that it is an insight created by an analysis of the given conception of a principle, and that we have found the conception of a principle to involve another conception. That is, if I—as I may or may not do—take hold of the conception of infinity, and, relating it to that of a principle, try to unite both in thinking, I discover that I not only can thus unite them, but must unite them. But infinity is rather a contemplation. Hence the proper expression in our case will be this: the conception of a principle—if that principle is not only thought but also contemplated, which may or may not be done—necessarily involves the law, that it can be contemplated only as an infinite principle. This is the fundamental law of analytical thinking, although an *a priori* law, which we here mention for the sake of logic which lacks it.

This infinite principle it is our present problem through our imagination to picture in its actual state of manifesting itself. It can be principle altogether only in relation to

itself—since there exists nothing outside of it—and in relation to itself only as a development or confining of freedom, since it is not capable of any other determination.

We have already spoken before of a development and confinedness of a freedom through which alone the various fundamental forms of consciousness can arise, but had then good reasons to suppose that this sort of development had its determined *terminus a quo* and *ad quem*, and that it formed a circumscribed sphere, and that, therefore, the principle was finite in relation to it. But now we speak of a development through an infinite principle; hence we may expect that freedom must here be thought by us under another determination; and these two different spheres must on no account be taken the one for the other until we shall be able to give their characteristic difference.

These manifestations of the principle absolutely exclude each other, and it is absolutely impossible that if the one occurs, any other one should occur. Hence if a new manifestation is to occur, the previous one must first have been annihilated and cancelled; they can follow only in succession. The annihilation of the one which is, is the condition of the possibility of the being of the other; and hence the former is *first*, and the second one *succeeds*. Thus that which remains always one and the same, proceeds through a series of successive changes, or through a *time*. This series never has an end, for the principle can become a principle infinitely. Thus we arrive at an infinite time. This one-and-the-same remaining has only *one* dimension, for it is itself an infinite succession of reciprocally excluding contents. The contents are not themselves the moments of time, for as parts of the one and same time they are altogether equal, but they make it possible to distinguish something in time. That which bears time, and forms its point of unity is the principle; the contents of the time and the points of disjunction are the manifestations of that principle.

Now what did our problem propose to picture? Evidently merely the principle in its actual state of being a principle, but our problem did not at all propose to picture time. The picture of time came of itself and joined itself of its own accord to that picture of the principle as soon as we tried to

form the latter. Hence we must express it thus: time is a law of that picturing which we are trying to discover, and its peculiar character as such law is this, that it does not confine and enchain us unseen and unconsciously—as the laws of thinking very often do—but that, while it binds us, it also represents itself to us in an image or picture. We must, therefore, furthermore try to explain this consciousness of time which enters our mind of its own accord.

Whenever freedom elevates itself actually and in fact over any limitation wherein it was previously confined, there arises a consciousness as the immediate being of this new-arisen freedom. This is a proposition which we have established above and from which we have drawn many conclusions already. Let us now apply this proposition to the present instance.

Our problem was to construct that principle by means of free imagination. Now, in doing this, imagination has already risen above its state of actually being such a principle; and hence the life of consciousness is, during that constructing, surrendered neither to its lower condition of being a principle, nor to a contemplation of the manifestations of that principle. Now this unsundered condition of life—which has arisen by means of the free act whereby consciousness determined itself to construct the principle—represents itself in a consciousness which, as the immediate expression of an inner condition, must appear as a given (not free) consciousness. This representation, or the immediate contemplation of the pure principle absolutely as such, is what is called time.

Illustration.—Do we by a free act produce time or not? We do not produce it by a conscious freedom of imagination as we produce, for instance, the required picture of the principle; but we do produce the ground of the contemplation of time, which ground is our arising beyond the condition of actually being principle by means of our imagination. At least, this is all the answer we can now give to that question; the final and decisive answer will appear only in the Science of Knowledge.

B.—In the foregoing we have deduced merely the pure form of time, empty of all appearance; and this happened because

our problem of a free thinking led us out of the natural progress of consciousness. But whatever reasons we may have had thus to proceed in the development of our subject, we must now turn back to its natural connection and show how consciousness arrives at an actual time. We put the question thus: is consciousness really compelled—of course, through some sort of a connection, since it can never be absolutely compelled—to place any of its results within time, as it certainly was compelled to place the objects of its external perception in space; or, is it indeed compelled by a peculiar synthesis to think any of its results as inseparable of a determined part of universal time and as filling up this determined part?

To explain: it might very well be possible to say, that consciousness develops itself in time, and cannot develop itself otherwise; i. e. for a supposed observer outside of consciousness, who thinks its unity and watches the changes of its conditions, and yet be also possible that the thus observed consciousness for itself were altogether merged with its whole essence into every point of its condition—which condition would appear to the observer as a time moment. In which case the then observed consciousness would for itself be altogether disjointed and new in every moment of its existence; and each of these its moments would appear to it as a peculiar, in-itself-complete world, utterly unconnected with any other moment. Such a consciousness would have neither time nor time-moments. Now if this is not to be thus, consciousness or the Ego must immediately in every such condition grasp it as the necessary part of a whole; must be compelled to connect immediately with the consciousness of the part the consciousness of the whole; must find it impossible to remain in the part, and impelled to proceed from it to the whole. But this whole, which embraces everything, is knowledge. Hence the Ego must be compelled to grasp or comprehend those other parts of the whole as also knowledge, though a different knowledge; that is, as the different knowledges of the one knowledge, which always remains the same; whereby, indeed, the Ego lapses into the contemplation of time, which we have described above.

But how is the Ego to arrive at such a necessity to proceed

beyond the part? Evidently thus: it must be impossible for the Ego to comprehend the part as existing—the thinking of the part as existing must be impossible and involve a contradiction—unless it connects this existence of the part to that of another part, which, however, cannot coëxist with the first part at the same time; in short, unless the given part is necessarily conditioned through another part. The conception of conditionedness has already been explained, and will be explained with still greater precision as we advance.

Remark, now, that this conception of conditionedness, which is here added, gives a new and more determined character to the whole previously described series of time-moments. For, whereas at first the different results of the principle merely excluded each other, so that if the one was to enter, the other one had to be annihilated—their place in the series being, however, utterly indifferent, and it being quite as well possible that *b* should precede *a* as that *a* should precede *b*—they now not merely exclude, but moreover *condition* each other; thus assigning to each moment its separate place or position in the series. It is no longer, as at first, a general before and after, but a determined before and after. The conditioning must precede the conditioned. Hence if the mind dwells upon this conditionedness of the parts of the time, it is driven to think the condition as the necessarily preceding, and from the thinking of this condition perhaps again to the thinking of its condition as the necessarily preceding, &c. &c.; that is, it may rise from a given *c* to a preceding *b*, and from that to a preceding *a*. Thus there arises the consciousness of an Ego, as that which remains one and the self-same in all the changes of its conditions, and with it the necessary requirement of an actual time in order to unite the contradiction in actuality.

Now, if these changing conditions were merely external perceptions for the individual who experiences them, then that consciousness of an Ego would be simply the consciousness of an Ego as an intelligence, or as a *knowing* Ego, but not of an Ego as a principle; and in this intelligence, or knowing Ego—since in its existence it is dependent upon the givenness of outer objects—having no guarantees of infinity and self-sufficiency, the time arising for it would not be infinite,

but simply indefinite. But if these observed changes of conditions consist of free imagining and thinking, then that one Ego which arises in consciousness is expressly considered as a principle, and its time is an actual, and in truth infinite time.

Now we are here thinking the Ego not as merely a knowing power or intelligence, but as a practical power or principle, and hence we proceed further thus: what does it mean when we say, that the manifold utterances or manifestations of the principle are conditioned through each other, those manifestations—as the mere outflow of the freedom of the principle—having in themselves no independent existence whatever which might enable them to have peculiar determinations as the things of external perception have, and thus whatever we assert of them is in truth asserted of the principle from which they flow? It clearly means this: the principle is conditioned in regard to its utterances, its self-development is confined to a determined sequence of series of those manifestations or utterances, a sequence that here continues infinitely. It can arrive at a certain end, *y*—however clear it may think it and propose it to itself as its end—in actuality only by proceeding in a certain sequence through *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, &c.

But whence arises this knowledge of the conditionedness of the Ego? Evidently, since it expresses a limitation of the principle in relation to its power in actuality, from the self-contemplation of its power. And thus the above promised definite description of the conception of conditionedness has become possible. That conception is founded upon the immediate self-contemplation of the faculty of the principle in its state of confinedness to an *a priori* determined sequence of moments in its development in actuality.

This conception will, therefore, make it possible with apodictical certainty to draw a conclusion from a given part of time as to what must have preceded that time—although that preceding has not been experienced in actual life—and thus to restore the past with sure accuracy by means of grounds. Thus it will also be possible in the same manner to draw conclusions from the same given time as to what will follow, and thus to make present the future; of course, under the presup-

position that everything will happen properly,—that is, that the principle will use its entire faculty, and limit itself by nothing except the absolute law of its self-development.

I ask you now: is this thus perceived series of moments perfectly ordered, each link having in it its determined position, from which it cannot move, and therefore its firmly determined moment in known time? Doubtless you must answer: Yes. I ask again: at which time in universal time does this whole known time occur? has it also its determined position in that universal time? Doubtless you will have to answer, No; that known time floats in an altogether undetermined position in the infinite time, which is empty at both of its ends.*

C.—*Appendix concerning the power of Recollection.*—We desire to speak of this power in general, and more specially at this place, as it excellently illustrates what we have said about time.

The power of recollection is, first of all, essentially different from the above described power to generate the contents of time absolutely *a priori* either of the past or of the future. For whereas the latter power asserts merely, that a certain content of time was necessary in the past, or will be necessary in the future, regardless as to whether such content has been actually experienced in life, and indeed without any reference to actuality whatever, the power of recollection asserts that a certain state or condition in the past has actually been, and been experienced.

Now, upon what is this power of recollection grounded? I answer: just like that former power, upon a relation of conditionedness; but with this difference, that whereas that former power is conditioned by a relation simply of the absolute possibility of the occurrence, the present power is conditioned by the given actuality of the occurrence. In the present given

* *Note of Translator.*—To the believers in a creation of the world out of nothing, and the dabblers in the metaphysics of physical science who think they can solve the problem of creation—which is no problem at all since the whole matter is an absurdity—I would recommend an energetic study of this latter proposition: that it is utterly of no importance into what part of universal time you place known time; a proposition that Leibnitz, in his controversy with Clark, used effectually not only in regard to time but also to space.

moment I do something within my consciousness; and I observe that I do this by means of a new reflection which rises above the actual doing. Then I ask, under what subjective condition of the occurred development of my faculty could I do so? I find, under this or that condition. Hence this condition must have already been filled by me with some actual deed, whilst it is at the same time represented to be as actual by the immediate causality of imagination. Perhaps this condition is again conditioned in the same factual manner by a necessary previous condition, which is represented to me in the same manner as actual, &c. Thus I am enabled to develop from the one given moment of my life conditions of my past life as having actually occurred; that is, to recollect them. For instance: let the given moment of my life be an attention,—for in the case of the pure and simple external perception, as described above, recollection does not take place at all, since no freedom occurs in it. Now in this attention the particular is reduced to the general, and the species to the genus. As soon as I become conscious of it, the question arises: how did I arrive at my knowledge of this general and this genus? Evidently in some previous representation, which must therefore have been thus or thus, and which is represented to the thereby excited higher attention through the immediate causality of imagination as actual, that is, as having previously occurred.

Or let the present moment be a construction by means of free imagination. This surely needs a material quality, taken from the external sense. But this quality must at some time have been given to me through an external perception. Then I can develop this external perception in the above described manner from this construction.

Or, finally, the present moment contains a free thinking. This occurs in accordance with some law of thinking known to me already, and which, therefore, I must have learned at some previous time. This previous state of my mind, however, I can again develop in my recollection in the above described manner. Hence:

1. The power of recollection is the free power of imagination as a faculty of reproduction, in the manner in which we have described that faculty before.

2. The power of recollection is a power which is altogether free, stands under the control of the will and reason, and is susceptible of further culture by means of practice and rules of art.

3. The law and thread which guides this power of imagination, and by means whereof that power assigns to the reproduced conditions their determined position in time, is—Conditionedness.

4. That power which causes the reproduced condition to appear not as a necessary one—as above, where only thinking was busy—but as an actually experienced condition of life, is the immediate causality-power of imagination, which, joining attention—as to whether the condition has been actually experienced or not—gives to the power of recollection its peculiar character.

5. The power of recollection is not an accidental phenomenon of consciousness which should be left to the science of psychology under the name of memory, but it is a necessary and inseparable component of consciousness, and belongs to such a representation of the one and absolute consciousness as we are establishing in these present Facts of Consciousness, and which must be grounded with the whole of consciousness in the general Science of Knowledge. Without this power or faculty the whole of consciousness would be sundered into separate and utterly disconnected moments, as we have described it above, and would never even get to be a consciousness of the Ego as the permanent substrate in the change of the conditions.

6. We may, therefore, establish the following proposition: in each last condition or state of consciousness the whole previous life of that consciousness is the conditioning; hence it is quite possible to develop the latter, in a *regressus* from each conditioned moment to the conditioning, from the former. That this proposition does not show itself to be true in actual perception in our power of recollection, arises from this: that if we are to recollect anything done by us, as thus done, we must do it from the first with consciousness and considerateness so as to become conscious at the same time of the law of our procedure. Thus all that part of our lifetime which, belonging to our earlier years, made itself out of

itself by our own immediate causality of imagination, as well as that which in mature life made itself through that same causality (through genius), does not come within the sphere of possible recollection, although in the latter case it may be well possible to recollect external circumstances. We may, therefore, venture upon the following general remarks respecting the power of recollection :

a. The condition of all recollecting is, that we should become clearly conscious of our freedom at that very moment which we wish to recollect, since it is only to this procedure that the thinking according to the law of conditionedness can connect; in short, that at that very moment we should ask ourselves : how do I come to do this, and how is it possible for me to do it?

b. The clearer, freer, and more under its own control, consciousness is in general, the more ready and powerful will be its power of recollection. The true principle of a science of mnemonics is the proposition: *sapere aude*.

c. In whatever branch of knowledge consciousness is most practised and accomplished, the power of recollection is also strongest. The practised philosopher, for instance, will find it very easy to restore the links of a series of thoughts, and to recollect the connections and the transitions of his argument; whereas he may have a very weak power of recollection for dates and names, since the worlds of dates and names are to him without any connection of thinking. In order to be able to recollect them, he would have to discover another source of connection:

d. Finally, the strengthening of our power of recollection requires a diligent practice of that power, by which practice alone we can acquire the art of developing the series of links quickly and without hesitation.

This, then, is the true power of recollection; a power which each one possesses in the same manner, and which each one can raise to a ready art in his mind by his own freedom. A particular favoritism of nature, talent, or genius, or whatever it may be called, has no influence upon it. What, then, do people mean when they speak of good and bad memories, &c., and make psychological investigations into the nature of

this very same power? Can we make no use at all of their teachings? Let us see.

We will say nothing about their investigations as to the retention of images in our senses, which merely exhibit their coarse materialism. It is not the images themselves that are retained, but we retain the imaging, the development of our power of imaging, and we cannot help but retain that, since it has become a component of our own self. This power or faculty we analyze, and it is on the occasion of this analysis that the images are again reconstructed. Hence it is in this development of his faculty that man carries along his whole lived time.

But then it has excited their attention that we often—when we indolently leave our mind to itself—hit upon the notion of something that is past. This, however, tends only to show what manner of men they were to whom this fact has appeared so remarkable. A free and able man has no room for notions in his consciousness, but gives unto his consciousness direction and contents with perfect freedom so long as he wakes and has power. Nevertheless we ought to explain the nature of these notions and their relation to memory. The explanation is this: such a notion is the immediate causality of the power of imagination—which cannot be inactive even though its free master rests—all through itself, and is here, more specially, the reproduction of an actually experienced condition of life; but with this distinction from free recollection, that in the present instance the immediate causality of imagination is not in a reciprocity with free and considerate attention, but proceeds its own way by itself. In short, it is the very same power of imagination which also produces dreams. Such a psychological memory is acquired only when we dream with open eyes. There is only one sort of this immediate causality of imagination which deserves a more honorable mention, namely, the reproduction through the eye, because it fills a vacancy left open by the free power of recollecting according to the law of conditionedness. For we more readily remember names, dates,—nay, whole speeches—when we have written them down, or read them in print, since then the immediate causality of imagination comes to the assis-

tance of free attention with an image of the written or printed character of the names, dates, &c. I should advise every one diligently to cultivate this sort of imagination for the sake of recollecting, wherever the mere connection of conditions is not sufficient.

THE LOGICAL QUESTION IN HEGEL'S SYSTEM.

Translated from the German of TRENDelenBURG by THOS. DAVIDSON.

When in logic a judgment is passed on Hegel's system as a system, there gathers round it, as a centre, what is to-day a great philosophic interest. The undersigned therefore, although himself a party in the case, will endeavor to give a short notice of the position of matters in the *logical question* since wishing, by that means, to bespeak for the pending investigation a greater interest than it has heretofore found.

There never yet was a system in which method and result, the principle of form, and the origin of the thing, were so closely united as in Hegel's. His "Dialectic of Pure Thought" attempts to create and to form the whole content. For with him the self-movement of self-related thought is, at the same time, the self-creation of Being. While Thought presses on from its unity to antitheses, and reconciles these antitheses in a new idea, thence going through, again and again, the same procedure, in these stages of the idea it is held to determine itself into so many grades of Being.

Any one who has studied Hegel, knows that this dialectic method with thesis, antithesis and solution—the dialectic method, with the metamorphosis of its negativity—imparts the common stamp to all his writings, and forms the imposing architecture of his entire system. It is the bond which binds all the thoughts; it is the motive which, as in a Gothic building, repeats in the parts the type of the whole, and in the whole the type of the parts. Its consistent carrying out of it into all the corners of the universe, the indefatigable execution, here in yielding, there in recalcitrant material, shows an energy of formation which hardly has its equal. With Hegel the dialectic method is like the law of a crystallization, in which all his ideas uniformly crystallize, and it shows a